UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,594	01/04/2007	Hisashi Akiyama	41412	1423
52054 PEARNE & GO	7590 03/11/201 ORDON LLP	EXAMINER		
1801 EAST 9T SUITE 1200		HOFFA, ANGELA MARIE		
	ОН 44114-3108	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3768		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/11/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com dchervenak@pearne.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/599,594	AKIYAMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Angela M. Hoffa	3768					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires <u>or indicate of the limital rejection</u> . The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
	out prings to the date of filling a bring	مط لمصمعت مطاعت النب					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better.	isideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).						
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Long V Le/	/A. M. H./						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768	Examiner, Art Unit 3768						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The 112,2nd paragraph rejections are not resolved by the proposed amendment. Other proposed amendments would require further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the art rejections from the final office action. However, the 112, 2nd paragraph indefinite rejections of claims 7-8 are not overcome and these features are proposed to be added to the independent claims. Specifically, the feature of "said data is inserted between the image data arrays at blanking times located between the image data arrays? An image data array is being interpreted as a data table, which is not thought to be equivalent to "time". Further, it seems that inserting any type of data onto a storage location on a data array is an artbitrary process. The utility of inserting oscillation information data between image data arrays is not understood. At least these issues need to be resolved within the claim language to correctly interpret and understand the scope of the invention. However, it is noted that the applied references do not teach blanking times and this feature, when cleared of the 112, 2nd paragraph issues, would further prosecution if added to the independent claims as suggested in the proposed amendments.